



# United States Department of the Interior

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY  
Washington, D.C. 20240

JAN 16 2003

Memorandum

To: Assistant Secretaries  
Deputy Assistant Secretaries  
Office Heads  
Bureau Heads

From: P. Lynn Scarlett *PJ S*  
Assistant Secretary - Policy, Management and Budget

Subject: Performance Data Credibility

The Department relies heavily on data to provide or improve services, evaluate programs, support decision making, and assess the condition of our public lands and resources. Accurate and reliable information is essential.

The Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) requires all agencies to describe the means by which performance data will be validated and verified in annual performance plans. But data credibility extends far beyond a basic descriptive narrative. As OMB Circular A-11 states, "The means used should be sufficiently credible and specific to support the general accuracy and reliability of the performance information that is recorded, collected and reported." We cannot expect to make prudent decisions and manage well if we are indifferent to the credibility of the data used to support our management actions.

Over the past several years, performance data validation and verification (Data V&V) have been uneven across the Department. In response, a Data V&V Assessment Matrix was developed by the Office of Planning and Performance Management in cooperation with bureau and Departmental offices, including the Office of the Inspector General (OIG). It can be used to elevate Data V&V systems to an acceptable functional level or help organizations test for potential weaknesses or gaps in implementation. Field tests of the Data V&V "matrix" conducted over this past year clearly demonstrated its utility as a detection tool for data quality control systems. The OIG has already expressed an interest in using the matrix as a performance data auditing tool.

Please distribute the attached Data V&V matrix immediately throughout your organization, with special attention to offices that collect, produce, assess or aggregate performance information. Please take steps now to ensure that your organization has proper performance data protocols in place, or establish them within 90 days of this memorandum. While your organization has discretion in establishing protocols, they should be based on the guidance provided in the Data

V&V matrix. Your office is responsible for ensuring that a Data V&V process is in place and used effectively. Although data need not be "perfect," they must serve their intended purposes and stand up to independent, objective external inspection, as well as to internal control reviews and audits. The Secretary of the Interior is also required to certify performance data completeness and reliability in her transmittal letter for the Department's Annual Performance and Accountability Report.

Bureau and office representatives to the DOI Performance Management Council, including the Department's Planning and Performance Management Office GPRA staff (LeRon Bielak, 202-208-1818) can assist with questions you may have. The Department will also meet with bureaus and offices during the upcoming year to discuss implementation practices and problems.

We have just completed a long and arduous process to develop a draft GPRA strategic plan for FY 2003-2008. This included lengthy and painstaking word smithing of performance measures that are now also being tied to SES performance agreements. We are also about to embark on a Department-wide system of Activity Based Costing/Management, which also has a heavy component of performance data. This is therefore perfect timing for making sure that we actually generate valid performance data that can demonstrate to the public and to ourselves that we are doing our job.

Attachment

cc: Performance Management Council  
PMB Office Heads

**DATA VALIDATION AND VERIFICATION  
ASSESSMENT MATRIX**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**

**December 2002**

LeRon E. Bielak, Office of Planning and Performance Management  
Phone: (202) 208-1818  
email: [leron\\_bielak@ios.doi.gov](mailto:leron_bielak@ios.doi.gov)

## Data Verification and Validation (Data V&V):

- What is the Data V&V “Matrix?”

It is a basic set of criteria that addresses two aspects of data integrity or credibility namely data validation and data verification. Validation is basically the first of six hurdles that must be successfully jumped. The validation criteria consists of a set of questions or sub-criteria to consider to determine if data that are being used are appropriate for the outcome that is being pursued. Verification is a little more complex. There are five different verification criteria to be satisfied, each with a suite of questions or sub-criteria to help determine if each criteria has been met. The distinction between validation and verification is based on a 1999 GAO report and reinforced by practices in a number of agencies with high marks for GPRAs and/or technical data credibility.

- When should the matrix be used?

This matrix is a means of assessing whether the GPRAs data provided by DOI to the Congress, the President, and the public is reliable and a valuable decision making tool. The matrix should be used to set up a process for validating and/or verifying GPRAs data before it is collected, consolidated, and reported and can be used to evaluate GPRAs data before it is used or published. The matrix can also be used to find gaps or weaknesses in an existing Data V&V process.

- Who should use the matrix?

All Interior offices that are engaged in the process of collecting, assembling, or reporting GPRAs data should establish a Data V&V system that as a minimum employs the principles of the Data matrix for assessing whether they are adequately ensuring the completeness and reliability of their GPRAs data.

- Why is Data V&V needed?

Basically, bad information begets poor decisions. If the information being used is not credible, there is no point in using it. Decisions based on inaccurate or unreliable data can adversely affect the decision making process. The importance of data validity and verification has been expressed through the Government Performance and Results Act (Results Act/GPRA) itself (Section 1115), through GAO investigations and reports (see Reference section), and through the requests and findings of Congressional Committees; e.g., report on management challenges by the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee and the recent House Governmental Affairs Committee request for an assessment of data reliability for ten key Departmental GPRA measures. The importance of data verification and validation is fundamental to all business and scientific practices and has been the subject of conferences and discussion groups, including those of the National Academy for Public Administration.

Congressional attention is rapidly turning away from rudimentary concerns with GPRAs reporting format and results of initial reports, to more substantive issues including the suitability and accuracy of the data being used as a barometer of Federal agency performance. Many agencies have recognized data issues and moved to address them and point out data limitations. The Department of the Interior must ensure that its performance information is reliable and that it is conducting internal evaluations to assess the state of its GPRAs data. This proposal offers an approach to the process of addressing data verification and validation in a systematic way across the Department and, in so doing, is providing a basis for insuring the reliability of performance data Department-wide.

Although the Results Act became law in 1993, its implementation and acceptance is still in a relatively early stage. Performance reports were not required under GPRAs until FY 1999, and questions about the efficacy and longevity of the GPRAs approach to performance management are finally fading. The emphasis of the new Administration on “results” has helped solidify GPRAs performance evaluation as a non-partisan and permanent management tool. Many businesses and governmental agencies are focusing more attention on performance measurement and using it as the vehicle for informing the public on how effectively they are accomplishing their missions and utilizing resources. However, imposing a major new reporting burden for determining data integrity could be counterproductive to achieving broader GPRAs acceptance and use. This approach was developed with two objectives in mind — First, to capture the basic process for producing credible data, and, second, to apply that approach across an organization without a massive “paperwork” burden.

## DATA VALIDATION

**Working Definition:** Validation is assessing whether data collected and measured are a true reflection of the performance being measured and having a clear relationship to the mission of the organization.

Validation -Criteria-
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Goal/Measure is appropriate to the identified mission of the organization</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>o Performance measured has direct bearing (relationship to) on the goal in question</li></ul>
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Goal/Measure is realistic and measurable</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>o Goal is achievable in the time frame established</li><li>o Goal is neither too aggressive in its expectations or set too low for easy achievement</li></ul>
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Goal/Measure is understandable to users</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>o Terms in goal statement are unambiguous and/or terminology is defined</li></ul>
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Goal/Measure is used in decision making</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>o Decision makers are identified and their judgement on continued use of the goal in decision making is periodically evaluated</li></ul>

Validation applies at several levels. First, it is important to establish that the goals that have been selected to measure the performance of the organization have a direct connection and relevance to the mission and desired outcomes that the organization is pursuing. Second, if that relationship is positively established, the next question to ask is whether the information that is collected clearly relates to the targets that have been set.

### *Illustration:*

If for example, the mission of an organization is to reduce the incidence of a certain disease, it is too indirect to measure the number of brochures that it has distributed to the public about the disease. While the brochures may be educational, their distribution is not a direct indicator of strategy being pursued. It will not inform decision makers of progress in disease eradication, and it may in itself be difficult to measure. For example, while brochures may be distributed to 2,000 centers for distribution, there is no gauge for determining who, if anyone, is taking and reading the information.

## DATA VERIFICATION

**Working definition:** Assessing data accuracy, completeness, consistency, availability and internal control practices that serve to determine the overall reliability of the data collected.

### Verification

-Criteria-

#### STANDARDS & PROCEDURES:

- Source data are well defined, documented; definitions are available and used**
  - o Data definitions are well documented and distributed\* to all responsible for specific data collection
  - o Responsible offices can document adherence to data definitions
  - o Definitions and standards are used in a consistent manner for all parties involved in specific data collection
- Collection standards are documented/available/used**
  - o Protocols and methodology for data collection are documented, distributed\* to all responsible for data collection, and adherence to the protocols is required and can be verified
  - o Review and edit procedures are defined and documented
- Data reporting schedules are documented/distributed/followed**
  - o GPRRA and other data reporting schedules linked to decisionmaking are issued\* to all parties responsible for data collection; timely data collection and reporting is mandated and enforced
- Performance data supporting documentation is maintained and readily available**
- Collection staff are skilled/trained in proper procedures**
  - o Those employees or contractors responsible for either collecting or assembling data are trained for the job. (For data entry responsibilities, see next page)

\* distribution can be electronic or hard copy

#### Illustration:

Standards and procedures refer to establishing the ground rules that should be applied to all data collection efforts for a specific measure. The question is whether the rules are consistently and uniformly applied and clearly communicated to those who are responsible for grass roots data collection. If procedures vary from locale to locale or among individual collectors, results will not be comparable and may not be legitimate. For example, having no clear definition of the data to be collected, or mechanisms by which data are collected will inevitably lead to problems in interpreting results or trusting the accuracy of the information. If data definitions are clear, but individuals are not well-trained for the collection effort, which may be complex, additional sources of error may be introduced. Requirements may very well differ from goal to goal, but for a single measure, the same standard should always apply.

## Verification -Criteria-

### **DATA ENTRY AND TRANSFER**

- Data entry methodology is documented and followed**
  - o Documentation of data entry procedures/protocols is available, understood by, and used by data entry personnel
    - o Data sources are identified and assumptions about sources are documented
    - o Methods used are comparable for all data entry locations
    - o Data is entered one time only and corrected by the original entrant (exceptions must be documented by a record trail of users)
  - o **Data are verified**
    - o Calculations are checked
    - o Data is checked for obvious inaccuracies (e.g. Feb. 31) and against business rules and other edits
    - o Data consistency checks are employed e.g. electronic editing when available
      - o Data is re-checked against source information (folders, case files, etc.)
- Procedures for making changes to previously entered data are documented and followed**
- Data are available when needed for GPR A reporting and other critical decision making cycles**
- Data entry staff are skilled and trained in proper procedures**

#### *Illustration:*

Despite the fact that efforts may have been taken to standardize data collection methodology, errors can be introduced when data are entered, transcribed, or transferred during the reporting process. Whether information is being entered into a computer database or being typed up in a report from handwritten notes, errors are possible. The question is whether there is any system in place for detecting these inadvertent errors. Has an office established protocols for checking and approving data that are transcribed in any way? Is there a procedure for addressing the problem of missing data and ensuring that calculations are correct? Does an office employ computer editing systems, when appropriate and feasible, to help identify data entry problems? The use of computer technology to capture data has afforded analytical tools and power that save considerable labor; however, the issue of the accuracy of data being analyzed can be too easily ignored. Identifying data entry or transfer errors is often a very tedious and unrewarding process, but the importance of follow through in this area is nevertheless high.

**Verification**  
-Criteria-

**DATA SECURITY AND INTEGRITY**

- Duplicate copies or back-up system for data exists**
  - o Procedures, including frequency of back up system use, is documented and followed
  - o Disaster recovery plan in place
- Data security protocols are in place and effective**
  - o Firewalls/password protection, access levels, etc. are established
  - o Security authority must be established for those responsible for data entry
- Equipment and program reliability cannot compromise data accuracy**
- Accountability for data integrity clearly rests with the person entering the data, and the responsible program specialist and manager.**

**Illustration:**

This area pertains to precautionary measures that must be taken in the event that computer malfunctions, natural disasters, or human error or actions occur that could affect collected data. Organizations must ensure, whether systems being used are hand-entered records or powerful relational database records, that data are not compromised by lack of attention to security of the data or to the reliability of systems or methods being employed to handle or house data. This means having duplicate records or back up files and ensuring that equipment being employed does the job it was set up or purchased to do. While some problems may be a rare situation, they do occur. For example, some mathematical processes with certain Pentium computers were found to introduce error due to a faulty processor a few years ago. As another example, back-up files, if stored within the same CPU unit on which they were produced, do not offer any additional protection to a malfunction of the hard drive or a fire in that office. These are more indirect considerations for the issue of data accuracy, but cannot be totally disregarded.

Another aspect of data security and integrity is the major question of unauthorized use of data. This could include both external and internal access issues from database "hacking" by external parties, to unauthorized use, including data manipulation, by parties who are not authorized users. A properly designed system will protect internal database systems against unauthorized external use, as well as establish password protection and a clearance process for database changes within the organization.

**Verification**  
-Criteria-

**DATA QUALITY AND LIMITATIONS**

- Accuracy limits of all data are defined
  - o Estimated data are identified; methodology for estimation is documented and is supportable; use of estimates are minimized
  - o Data with margins of error due to accuracy of instrumentation or interpretive leeway, are identified and margin of error (e.g. +/- 1%) is reported.
  - o Incomplete data are identified as such and extent of missing data is reported
  - o Preliminary data are identified and qualifications on data are described; timetable for delivery of final data should be documented
- Any other data limitations are explained and documented
- Method for handling anomalous data is established and used
  - o Data that appears to be incongruous compared to most other data obtained is analyzed and explained
- 3<sup>rd</sup> party evaluations are conducted
  - o Objective internal and/or external parties are periodically used to verify accuracy/quality of data
  - o Use of other cross-checks on data quality such as comparison to similar databases are employed and documented
- Use of externally controlled data is documented
  - o Need to use external data is established
  - o External is identified as such
  - o Degree of completeness and limitations of external data are documented

**Illustration:**

While every action may be taken to ensure that data are accurately entered, transcribed, reported or otherwise reproduced, there is an underlying question of whether the data itself is accurate or has some inherent limitations. For example, do reports clearly specify that performance may be based on partial data or estimates or that the source of the data is a third party? Do we have any control over such third party data or know how whether the data is accurate or has certain limitations? Are data reported with a confidence interval if that is applicable? Is there a track record for any changes that may have been made over time to the information and why that change

was made? In some cases, confidence in data may be bolstered by employing third parties to evaluate the data by peer review, under contract, through an auditing process, or other options. Qualifications on reported data are important pieces of information to decision makers within an agency and in Congress. Recent evaluations of agency performance reports have commended agencies who have explicitly addressed the question of data limitations.

## Verification -Criteria-

### **OVERSIGHT AND CERTIFICATION**

- Accountability for data accuracy exists in performance standards**
  - o Accountability resides with all employees responsible for accuracy of data
- Responsible officials certify that procedures were followed each reporting period**
  - o Signed certifications are filed
- Responsible officials certify that data accuracy has been checked each reporting period.**
  - o Signed certifications are filed

### *Illustration:*

The underlying purpose of GPRAs is to establish accountability. From the Congressional viewpoint, this means establishing a clear connection between an agency's mission, the work it sets out to do, and what it accomplishes for the funds that have been authorized and appropriated for those purposes. Within each level of an agency, accountability must rest with individuals and officials who are delegated the authority and responsibility for achieving certain goals and striving for specific outcomes. This essentially means that a system of checks and balances are employed to encourage an integrated effort to achieve desired results. Practically speaking, it may often be difficult for management to determine whether information collected or generated by employees is accurate and complete. If they have had extensive prior experience in the area, management may have considerable insight into the processes involved and how to evaluate results. Regardless of the depth of knowledge, staff and management must both be accountable for GPRAs data reported. While incorporating accountability into performance standards or employing certifications or attestations to data accuracy will not guarantee that GPRAs data is valid and verifiable, such measures will reinforce the importance of accountability and responsibility for performance measurement data and tend to improve the odds that decision makers are dealing with bona fide and reliable information.